

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 5-14, 19-22, 28, 29, and 44-58 are pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application in view of these remarks.

In paragraph 3 of the final office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-14, 19-22, 28, 29, and 44-58 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,640,987 ("Tsukada"), and these rejections were maintained in the 6/6/06 advisory action.

Revival of Abandoned Application

On 6/16/06, the Examiner participated in a telephonic interview with the Applicant's attorney Kevin Drucker. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of that interview. As discussed during the interview, claims 1, 2, 5-14, 19-22, 28, 29, and 44-58 are allowable over Tsukada because Tsukada fails to teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having a plurality of handsets, with the base unit and plurality of handsets each at a different location, as required by all of the pending claims. During the interview, the Examiner and his Supervisor agreed with the Applicant regarding the deficiencies of Tsukada and said they would vacate the pending Final Office Action and issue a new action. To confirm this, on 6/28/06, the Examiner and his Supervisor mailed an Interview Summary stating, "In accordance with the discussion with applicant's representative, Kevin Drucker, the previous final office action is vacated and a new office action will be issued."

However, the Examiner never issued any new office action. Instead, on 4/5/07, the Examiner issued a Notice of Abandonment, alleging that no reply was received in response to the 6/6/06 Advisory Action.

A Petition to Withdraw the Improper Holding of Abandonment was filed on 4/13/07, which was denied on 7/18/07 because "the supervisor was without the authority to withdraw the finality of the Office action on June 16, 2006 as the statutory period had expired and the application was no longer pending without the necessary extension of time. The Office sincerely regrets that this insufficiency was not brought to the attention of applicant's representative at the time of the interview."

A Petition Under 37 CFR §1.137(b) for Revival of Abandoned Application was filed on 10/5/07, which the Office of Petitions dismissed because no reply to the 6/6/06 advisory action was ever filed. The Office of Petitions stated that this application would remain abandoned until a response to the advisory action was filed and recommended that the Applicant file a request for reconsideration, together with a response to the advisory action.

Therefore, a Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR §1.137(b) for Revival of Abandoned Application was filed on 8/27/08, along with a request for reconsideration in response to the 6/6/06 advisory action, to permit the entry of this response and the continued examination of this application. However, a Decision on this Renewed Petition was mailed by the USPTO on 12/2/09, indicating that the request for reconsideration did not place the application in condition for allowance and therefore must be filed with a Request for Continued Examination in order to revive the application.

Accordingly, a Second Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR §1.137(b) for Revival of Abandoned Application is being filed herewith, along with a Request for Continued Examination, so that the application can be revived, and prosecution can continue.

Art Rejections

For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 5-14, 19-22, 28, 29, and 44-58 are allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 1, 2, and 19-22

Claim 1, as amended in the Amendment filed on 5/9/06, recites:

1. A method of answering an incoming call at a cordless telephone having a base unit and a plurality of handsets, each of said base unit and plurality of handsets being at a different location, the method comprising the steps of:
answering, by a first party, the incoming call at one of said plurality of handsets;
after the incoming call is answered and while the incoming call is active, initiating an intercom connection between handsets, by an intercom initiating party, to alert an intercom receiving party, the intercom connection permitting voice communication between the intercom initiating party and the intercom receiving party;
automatically placing said incoming call in a hold status if either said intercom initiating party or said intercom receiving party is also said first party; and
accepting said incoming call at another one of said plurality of handsets, by said intercom receiving party, by terminating the hold status.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having a plurality of handsets, with the base unit and plurality of handsets each at a different location. Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. While the Examiner cites to FIGs. 1 and 3-7 of Tsukada as teaching the foregoing features, these figures only depict a single base unit and a single handset. The Examiner also cites column 6, lines 5-35, column 4, lines 61-66, and column 12, lines 3-11, of Tsukada as teaching the foregoing features, but these portions of Tsukada also fail to mention anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. In fact, nowhere in Tsukada does the plural word “handsets” ever appear. Since there is no plurality of handsets in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate initiating an intercom communication between handsets or answering an incoming call at one of the handsets and accepting the call at another of the handsets.

Since claims 2 and 19-22 depend variously from claim 1, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 5, 28, and 29

Claim 5, as amended, recites:

5. A method of answering an incoming call at a cordless telephone with a base unit and at least a first handset and a second handset, said base unit and said at least first and second handsets being at separate locations, the method comprising the steps of:
a first party answering the incoming call at a first handset of the cordless telephone;
the first party alerting a second party, by initiating an intercom connection between said first handset and said second handset, while the incoming call is automatically placed in a hold status, the intercom connection permitting voice communication between the first party and the second party; and
the second party accepting the incoming call at the second handset by terminating the hold status.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having at least a first handset and a second handset, with the base unit and the at least first and second handsets being at separate locations. As discussed above, Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. The cited FIGs. 1 and 3-7, column 6, lines 5-35, column 4, lines 61-66, and column 8, lines 58-67, of Tsukada fail to teach, disclose, or even suggest anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. Since there is only a single handset and a single base in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate a step of initiating an intercom connection between a first handset and a second handset, nor the steps of answering the incoming call at a first handset and accepting the incoming call at a second handset.

Since claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 5, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 6-8

Claim 6, as amended, recites:

6. A cordless telephone system comprising:
a base station including first control circuitry for controlling operations at said base station; and
at least two cordless telephone handsets for communicating with said base station, each including second control circuitry for controlling operations at said handset;
said first and second control circuitry operating in response to initiation of an intercom communication at a first of said handsets to place an active call at the first handset on hold during said intercom communication, the intercom communication permitting voice communication between at least two of said handsets.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having at least two cordless telephone handsets. As discussed above, Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. The cited FIGs. 1 and 3-7, column 6, lines 13-35, column 4, lines 61-66, column 12, lines 37-47, and column 4, line 65, to column 5, line 21, of Tsukada fail to teach, disclose, or even suggest anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. Since there is only a single handset and a single base in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate the placement of an active call at at least one of the handsets on hold, nor initiation of an intercom communication at one of the handsets, nor an intercom communication permitting voice communication between at least two of the handsets.

Since claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 9-11

Claim 9, as amended, recites:

9. (Currently Amended) A cordless telephone system comprising:
a base station including first control circuitry for controlling operations at said base station; and
at least first and second cordless telephone handsets for communicating with said base station including second and third control circuitry for controlling operations at said first and second handsets respectively;

said first, second and third control circuitry operating in response to initiation of an intercom communication at one of said first and second handsets to place an active call on hold during said intercom communication, the intercom communication permitting voice communication between at least two of said handsets.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having at least first and second cordless telephone handsets. As discussed above, Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. The cited FIGs. 3-7, column 6, line 13, to column 7, line 47, column 12, lines 3-47, and column 4, line 65 to column 5, lines 21, of Tsukada fail to teach, disclose, or even suggest anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. Since there is only a single handset and a single base in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate placing an active call at at one of the handsets on hold, nor initiation of an intercom communication at one of the first and second handsets, nor an intercom communication permitting voice communication between handsets.

Since claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 12-14

Claim 12, as amended, recites:

12. A cordless telephone system comprising:
a base station including first control circuitry for controlling operations at said base station and separate intercom buttons for each of a plurality of cordless telephone handsets, said plurality of cordless telephone handsets comprising at least first and second cordless telephone handsets for communicating with said base station and including second and third control circuitry for controlling operations at said first and second handsets, respectively, and a separate intercom button for said base station and each other of said handsets;

said first, second, and third control circuitry operating in response to initiation of an intercom communication at one of said first and second handsets to place an active call on hold during said intercom communication, the intercom communication permitting voice communication between at least two of said handsets.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a base station having separate intercom buttons for each of a plurality of cordless telephone handsets, nor at least first and second cordless telephone handsets for communicating with said base station. As discussed above, Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. The cited FIGs. 3-7, column 6, line 13 to column 7, line 47, column 8, lines 58-67, column 12, lines 3-47, and column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 21, of Tsukada fail to teach, disclose, or even suggest anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. Since there is only a single handset and a single base in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate at least first and second cordless telephone handsets having a separate intercom button for said base station and each other of said handsets, nor initiation of an intercom communication at one of the first and second handsets, nor an intercom communication permitting voice communication between handsets.

Since claims 13 and 14 depend variously from claim 12, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

Claims 44-58

Claim 44, as amended, recites:

44. A method of communicating between handsets in a multi-device telephone system, wherein:
the system comprises a base station and at least two wireless handsets; and
the system is adapted to permit voice communication (i) between at least two of the wireless handsets and (ii) between at least one of the wireless handsets and an external telephone via a telephone network,
the method comprising:
(a) making a first connection for voice communication between a first handset and the external telephone; and
(b) placing the first connection on hold while attempting to make a second connection for voice communication between the first handset and a second handset of the system.

Nowhere does Tsukada teach, disclose, or even suggest a cordless telephone having at least two wireless handsets. As discussed above, Tsukada teaches only a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. The cited FIGs. 1 and 5-7, column 6, lines 13-35, and column 12, lines 3-59, of Tsukada fail to teach, disclose, or even suggest anything other than a base unit 2A and a single handset 1A. Since there is only a single handset and a single base in Tsukada, this reference cannot possibly anticipate devices comprising a base station and at least two wireless handsets, nor voice communication between handsets.

For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 49 and 54 are also allowable over Tsukada.

Since claims 45-48, 50-53, and 55-58 depend variously from claims 44, 49, and 54, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Tsukada.

The Applicant submits therefore that the rejections of claims under Section 102 have been overcome.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the now-pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2009
Customer No. 46900
Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Kevin M. Drucker/
Kevin M. Drucker
Registration No. 47,537
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)